

REMARKS**Introduction**

In response to the final Office Action dated December 17, 2007, Applicants have amended claim 22. Claims 1-21, 28, and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 31-37 have been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Entry of Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

The Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response. Support for amended claim 22 is found in, for example, originally filed claim 28. New claim 31, introduced in this amendment, includes the pertinent limitations of originally filed claims 22 and 29. Support for new, dependent claims 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 is found in, for example, claims 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 30, respectively. Hence, the amended claims have already been substantively examined. Moreover, the present Amendment does not generate any issue that would require substantive further consideration. Moreover, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure sets forth in Section 714.12 that “any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered.” Entry of these claim amendments is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 28 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The limitations of claim 28, previously dependent upon claim 22, have been incorporated into claim 22, and claim 28 cancelled.

Claim 29 has been cancelled in this Amendment. However, new independent claim 31, introduced in this amendment, includes the limitations of claims 22 and 29.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14, 16, 18, 22-26 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,886 to Ratell et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in view of the amendment cancelling claims 1-14, 16, and 18. In accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, the limitations of claim 28, previously dependent upon claim 22, have been incorporated into claim 22, and claim 28 cancelled.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15, 17, 19-21, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratell et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot in view of the amendment cancelling claims 15, 17, and 19-21. Dependent claim 27 is allowable for at least for the same reasons as independent claim 22, and further distinguishes the claimed method of manufacturing a load sensor.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Lisa A. Kilday
Registration No. 56,210

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 NDM:LAK
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 17, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**